

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXV. No. 21.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1814. [Price 1s.

[641]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AFFAIRS OF FRANCE.—The *fear* and the *malice* (natural offspring of fear) which some persons, in this country, discover towards the French nation, and even towards the King of France, is truly wonderful. One would have thought, that common decency; that the ordinary feelings of men, would, for some months, at least, have restrained these persons from discovering their odious passions. When they, who have so long been bawling for the fall of Napoleon, and for the restoration of the Bourbons; when they saw the accomplishment of their wishes; when their very desires seem to have been outstripped by events, surely we had a right to expect, that they would not endeavour to throw obstacles in the way of peace. We, surely, had a right to expect, that, after having spent eight hundred millions of *debt*, and four hundred millions of *taxes*, upon the war, and for the sake of “social order,” *real peace* with France would be the fruit of such enormous sacrifices. It was not peace with Holland, and the Germans and Russians, that we so much sighed for; but with France, that fighting nation; that nation so near to us; that nation, whose hatred we ought to dread, and whose friendship we ought to cultivate; that nation, which, in fact, is Europe in itself. But, behold! the King of France is not yet crowned, before these same people, these identical persons, begin to endeavour to excite all sorts of suspicions, not only against the French nation, but against the French *Court*. They appear to have discovered, that France, though her Ruler be changed, is still the same country, inhabited by the same people, endued with the same qualities and faculties. This was, indeed, a discovery, that it was very easy to make; facts easy to have foreseen. But these people were blinded by their dread of Napoleon, and their eagerness to overset his power. They have now opened their eyes, and, the real truth is, that, upon looking at the state of things alto-

ther, they know not what to think of it, or what to do or say.—To their utter astonishment, they perceive, that *a re-establishment of the old order of things is impossible*. They perceive, that the Revolution, upon the whole, must end in great good to France. They perceive, that the result will not answer their expectations; no, nor *anyone* of their expectations. They see, that France will enjoy something like freedom, at least, and they dread the effect of such an example. Their first endeavour, therefore, is to prevent the King from keeping his promise with the nation; or, at least, to prepare, before hand, a justification for his so doing.—Relative to this subject, I am about to quote a passage from the COURIER newspaper of the 12th instant:—“Pamphlets (says that ‘Journal) are published at Paris both for ‘and against the Senate; in other words, ‘whether a Representative Government ‘shall be given to France; or whether ‘the old Constitution shall be restored as ‘nearly as possible? The King, we ‘know, has pledged himself to establish the ‘former. But we have little difficulty in ‘saying, that the people of France, at present, are not in a condition to bear the ‘representative system. If we may be allowed the expression, they are not sober enough for legislative discussions.—“We have grown up with our Constitution, and our Constitution has grown up with us. We have been framed for it by our forefathers; but it were absurd to expect that the public mind in another nation should all at once be fitted for the same system. However, the experiment is to be tried again, and we have little doubt it will fail again. May its failure not be attended with the same disasters and miseries to which France has been subject for nearly a quarter of a century!” The first remark that offers itself here is, that there must, if this statement be true, be a great deal of *real liberty* of the press in France: not *sham, not humbug liberty* of the press; but *real liberty* of the press. For, unless

this were the case, there could not be such discussions. I like this; for discussion, *free* discussion, must do good. I do not object to any man's writing in favour of the *ancient régime*, provided, that other men are allowed *freely to answer him*.—But, it is a sad sham, when the *liberty* of the press is all on one side; when every one may write in favour of a system, however corrupt and essentially tyrannical, while no one dares to say a word to prove the *falsehood* of what has been said in *favour* of such system. Discussion must do great good in France; and, in spite of all that fraud, and bribery, and force can do, some of the good must, in the end, extend itself to other countries.—We are told here, that, though the King has *pledged* himself to establish a *representative government*, the people of France are not in a *condition* to bear the *representative* system.—And, then, we are reminded, that WE have grown up with OUR Constitution, and that it has grown with us; but, that we are not to expect that the public mind, in another nation, should, all at once, be fitted for the SAME system. Very true. But this writer seems to labour under a very great error. He appears to suppose, that, if the King of France adheres to his promise, the French people will have the same system as we have; than which nothing can be farther from the truth. There will be no *boroughs* in France; no *counties*, where it will cost many hundreds of thousands of lives to obtain a seat in the *Corps Legislative*; no *Gattons*, no *Old Sarum*, no *St. Michaels*, no *Corporations*. These, indeed, it would require time, and a long time, to make the minds of the people of France familiar with. A system like *this*, indeed, the French people may, very likely, not be "in a condition to bear." It requires much time, and many measures, to convince a people of the excellence of such a system, and to induce them to look upon it as the best in the whole universe.—But, the system of representation about to be established, or, rather, *confirmed*, in France, the people there will easily understand, and as easily practise. For, what difficulty is there in the people who pay the taxes meeting, in their several districts, and there choosing Electors, who, again, are to choose the members of the *Corps Legislative*, by whose voice the taxes are to be granted? What difficulty can there be, either in understanding, or

in practising, a system like this? There will be no complexity in the thing. There will be no exclusions which are not bottomed upon some general principle. There will be no everlasting doubts, and scrutinies, and law suits, about old charters.—There will be no disputes about who has *boiled a pot*, and who has not boiled a pot. If, indeed, the system about to be confirmed in France included the existence of peculiar privileges in *pot-walloppers*, or any other persons, relative to elections, I should agree with this writer, that it must take time to fit the peoples' minds to it; but, amongst all the freaks of Napoleon, he never appears to have once thought of *pot-walloppers*.—Oh, no! there are to be no burgage tenures and *pot-walloppers* in France. If there were, it would, I agree, be very difficult to arrange the matter. It requires centuries of time, and the profoundest state of wisdom, to bring a constitution to this pitch. But, though the French people cannot be fitted for such a system as ours, all at once, it does not follow, that they are incapable of a system which is representative. They have *voices*, as well as other nations; and they are as capable of making use of them. What then, when called upon in their different Communes, is to prevent them from choosing men in whom they have confidence? And why is the attempt to confirm their liberty to fail?—But, it seems, that the representatives, if chosen properly, "are not sober enough for *legislative discussion*." What does this writer mean? Are the French a *drunken* people? He will hardly say that. He means then, that they are *too hasty*, too apt to be *passionate*. In the first place, this has never appeared; and, whoever looks at the codes of Napoleon will agree, that more wisdom, more real political wisdom, a more profound knowledge of human nature, and a more minute acquaintance with human concerns, joined to a more solicitous and tender regard for human rights and happiness, were never discovered by any legislator, or legislators, in the whole world. Are the French an *ignorant* or a *frivolous* people? Let their works, whether philosophical or literary; let their sciences and arts; let these be compared with those of any other nation, and, it will be seen, I believe, that they take the lead in all those endowments which raise man in the scale of beings. Take their theatrical pieces; compare them with our's; put the

elegan
the rea
manie,
pieces
by the
canting
of our
the Fr
of min
pieces,
admire
audience
mind o
my own
the cha
to be g
play-ac
uttering
and mis
swelled
sters, to
the imp
this wr
freedom
called
though,
one's d
speakin
admitte
ing of t
criterion
the char
of Fran
sentimen
sound pl
ing and
interesti
seldom p
cians ca
and put
them; a
of king
country
giving i
ling peop
women s
the who
monstrou
And, I s
are most
grave er
matter o
as the fi
transposi
ing battl
fired can
ing whic
the midd
instantly

elegant language, the wit, the sentiment, the reasoning, the philosophy of the *Méromanie*, the *Joueur*, or any one of a hundred pieces that might be named, and put them by the side of the grovelling style, the canting palaver, and horse-laughter trash of our comedies, and then say, whether the French are a people without solidity of mind. The very circumstance that pieces, like those that I have named, are admired in France, and attract crowded audiences, is sufficient to characterize the mind of the nation; and, for the sake of my own country, I wish I could say, that the character of its mind was in no degree to be gathered from the circumstance, that play-actors in London find their account in uttering strings of dirty double-meanings and miserable puns from the lips of a person swelled out, by the means of pillows and bolsters, to the size of a sugar-hogshead.—It is the impudent, the malignant observations of this writer, levelled, at bottom, against the freedom and happiness of France, that have called forth this comparison from me; though, perhaps, it would, at any time, be one's duty to have made it. I am not speaking of exhibitions, where people are admitted at two-pence a head. I am speaking of the *national theatres*, which are the criterion of the taste of a people, and of the character of the public mind. In that of France I see beautiful language, refined sentiment, brilliant wit, fine reasoning, sound philosophy, all displayed in the forming and the unravelling of fables the most interesting, never violating nature, and seldom probability. In ours, I see *magicians* calling forth thunder and lightening, and putting spells upon those who offend them; *witches*, foretelling the fall and rise of kings, and woods walking over the country to fulfil their predictions; *ghosts*, giving information of murders, and troubling people in their sleep; and *men* and *women* so much out of nature, as to make the whole of the representation a thing too monstrous to be endured by common sense. And, I see this, too, in those pieces which are *most admired* by fashionable people and grave critics. But, indeed, even this is not matter of surprise, when we see extolled, as the *first of Poems*, a mass of crabbed transpositions and inflated periods, narrating battles in heaven, in which the Devils fired cannon against the Angels, and during which a Devil, having been split down the middle by an Angel, the two halves instantly smacked up together, and restored

the said Devil to his former state. In the same Poem we are presented with familiar dialogues between God the Father, and God the Son; and are shewn the latter taking a *pair of compasses* out of a celestial *drawer*, in order to describe the boundaries of the earth!—And this is what we admire. To honour and to perpetuate the works containing these marks of disordered imaginations, we lay out thousands and thousands of pounds upon splendid printing and engraving.—And is it, then, for us to charge the French nation; is it for us to charge the admirers of Voltaire, Rousseau, Racine, Destouches, and Regnard; is it for us to charge them with ignorance, prejudice, and want of solidity of mind? And, if the charge, as applied to the whole nation, would be unjust, whence are we to infer, that the representatives of the people of France would not be sufficiently *sober* for legislative discussion? For my part, I care little about the *taste* of either country; but, it is necessary to meet, in all sorts of ways, every attempt to justify an endeavour to stifle freedom in France, and to introduce that regime, under which the French people groaned for so many centuries. Every thing belonging to France is interesting; because, whatever is done there will have a certain vogue in the world. The eyes of all the nations of Europe are fixed upon France: her acts must, therefore, be of the greatest consequence. And, who can express a sufficient degree of indignation against those, who, like this writer and his like, are endeavouring to cause the ancient regime to be re-established in that country? They express their decided opinion, that the representative government *will fail*. They are ready to din the public with their fears; but their real fear is, that it *will succeed* in establishing freedom in France, under a constitutional King, and under a system which, being open and frank, will put *hypocrisy* and *shame*, and *vile cheater* to shame. Why, I ask, should these people be so set against representative government in France? Why should they be so eager to decry it? It is notorious, that, for ages, previous to the French Revolution, we, in this country, were by all our speech-makers, and book-makers, and news-writers, bid to hold the French government in abhorrence. ADDISON, that famous partisan of the Hanoverian Succession, used this argument against the Pretender. “What,” said he, “would Eng-

"lishmen, free-born Englishmen, have to expect at the hands of a King, educated in such a country as France, where the Sovereign is absolute, and the people the most wretched of slaves?" And yet we now want, or, at least, some of us want, to see re-established that very government! What are the French to think of such conduct?—But all this is explained, when we come to another part of the same paper. Not, indeed, the same article; but the same paper. There the hatred of *France* breaks forth in all its native odiousness; and, by putting the two together, we see clearly, and, I trust, that all Frenchmen will see, that it is *hatred* of them (growing out of base fear), which makes these persons desirous of seeing the promises of the King violated. If we find a man advising ourselves not to make a certain bargain, for instance, lest we should lose by it, and if we find the same man speaking to others, and endeavouring to excite ill-will against us, we may pretty safely conclude, that such bargain would be to our advantage.—The following is the article I allude to:—"To the principle of ceding the Colonies we have conquered, particularly to France, we have before stated our objections. To render France powerful by giving her colonies, enabling her to create an extensive marine, and fostering her political strength by the wealth of commerce, is a dangerous experiment. It is dangerous to us. France has the means of greatness within herself. Great Britain owes her political greatness, and even her independence, to her maritime power and to foreign trade. France, without trade and colonies, has been a match for combined Europe; and it will be well to reflect whether, by giving her these in addition to the combined powers, they are not endangering that equilibrium they have been so anxious to establish. Is it nothing to say, that France before the Revolution had the advantages in question? She had, and she used them for purposes of gross aggression. To raise that monarchy to unlimited power was for ages the unvarying aim of her Court. But France knows her power now better than she ever knew it. Her vast resources, her military endowments, her political influence have been displayed by the revolutionary governments in succession, on a scale large beyond the contemplation of her old politicians; and will not this be a strong in-

" duement to the *national vanity*, the military ardour of that people, again, to try their strength with their neighbours as soon as they have recovered from their disasters? They who depend much upon *the change which has taken place in their government* will do well to recollect, that "the disgraceful interference of France in the quarrel between us and our American colonies took place under a Bourbon of the best character; yet, though Louis XVI. himself was averse to the American war, on the ground of its injustice, his voice was overruled by the majority of his Council."—This malignant writer could not help even to rip up the old subject of revenge, the *American War!*—What! now that the Bourbons are restored, we are to recollect the "disgraceful interference of France in the quarrel between us and America." And we are to bear in mind, too, that this took place under a *Bourbon*! Take the whole of this article together, and, I think, you see in it as much malice as can possibly discover itself in a like compass. The French nation is to be kept in a *low state*; the French nation is *mischiefous*; the French nation is *perfidious*; she is the same under all sorts of *rulers*; and, therefore, we ought not to suffer her to get power by any means.—The Allies, indeed, before they got to Paris, told the French people that France ought to be *great* and happy; and that it was for the good of Europe that she should be so. Nay, they expressed their intention of extending her ancient limits; of leaving her an extent of territory, which, under her kings, she never knew.—How different is this language from that of our newspaper writers! They want even a part of the allied forces to be kept up in France for years!—But the truth is, that these detestable men think about nothing but the prospect of France being happy and free. The sworn foes of freedom, who **WRITE** these articles, and (by what means I need not say) cause them to be published; these supporters of every thing oppressive; the abettors of tyranny. These men, who thrive by what renders a people miserable. These men are, just at this moment, wonderfully puzzled. Napoleon has disconcerted them by his abdication, very nearly as much as he ever did before by his wonderful feats in arms. Greater at last than ever, he saved France from a *civil* war, and left her in a state to be great, and to be a thorn in the

side of tyranny, in spite of every thing that could be done. These enemies of the freedom and happiness of man are now strangely put to it to know what to wish for. If the King of France break his promise, there may yet arise a *Republic*. That would affright them out of their senses.—The two great Republics, France and America, taught by experience, might join their efforts. The consequences might be alarming indeed! If, on the other hand, the King of France keep his promise, there will be a *real* representative government in France, as to the commons, at any rate. It will not be a vile *sham*; not a gross and outrageous insult to the people amongst whom it exists. The King of France ought to bear in mind, that the same persons who recommend to the Allies to keep part of their armies in France in violation of the Convention; who protest against giving up any colonies to France; who advise the Allies to take away the pictures and statues from Paris; who bid the people of England bear in mind the conduct of the *Bourbons* in the American war; and who assert, that it is necessary for us always to recollect, that France is radically and systematically our enemy: that these same persons are the persons who are anxious that France should *not* have a representative government, and that the ancient regime *should* be restored.—This is what the King of France should have *always before his eyes*.—It is quite surprising what *envy* already discovers itself in some persons towards France. They have, for a long while, been representing her as in the lowest depths of misery; and yet they see what excites their envy, and they endeavour to communicate their feelings to us. How inconsistent is this? We are to envy those who are in misery: we are to envy those who are beggared. We are to dread the *power* of a nation, which, they tell us, is subdued and disgraced to the lowest degree! Does there not peep out, through all this mass of inconsistency, a consciousness of the vast stock of glory acquired by France? They tell us of the *vanity* of the French. Is it vanity in them to boast of a hundred great victories? Is it vanity in them to boast of their having captured Vienna, Rome, Naples, Berlin, Amsterdam, and Moscow; and that, too, against all Europe combined? Can any thing, can volumes of lies about the *fears* and *cowardice* of Napoleon; can all the efforts of an enslaved and hire-

ling press, ever extinguish the recollection of Jemappe, Marengo, the Helder, Corunna, Jena, Austerlitz, Lodi, Eylau, Moskwa, and a hundred other names; every one of which, upon the bare mention, reminds the world of the valour of Frenchmen? And, are such a people to be accused of vanity, because they *talk* of those things; or, rather, because the world do, and must talk of them? *We* do not seem to think it *vanity* in us to talk of *our* victories. God knows we talk of them enough. We are granting immense sums to build mansions, and provide estates for our commanders. I do not find fault with this; but, surely, if we find this right for such victories as *we* have gained, the French may be suffered to *talk* a little about Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, Eylau, and the Helder! *Talk* is very cheap, at any rate. It costs the people nothing. The French military glory has no *pudding* attached to it. “*Honour and our Country*,” inscribed upon a little medal, is all that a Frenchman gets for his deeds in arms. Our rewards are more solid. No harm in that; but, surely, those who have overrun all the countries of Europe; who have scattered the ill-gotten wealth of the Romish church, and who have opened the dungeons of the Inquisition, may be allowed to *talk* a little of what they have done! Aye, and *history* will *talk* of what they have done too. Spain, Italy, Portugal, all Germany, and even Russia, has felt the effect, I mean the *moral* as well as the military effect, of the marches of the French armies, who have borne, from one end of Europe to the other, the light of philosophy, though, perhaps, they did not intend it. These armies have been instruments in the hands of reason, of truth, and of liberty. They have given to superstition and tyranny a blow that those monsters will never recover. And, in this sense, the valour and skill of the French have been the greatest of benefactors to the world. Are such a people to be called *vain*, because they *talk* of their deeds? But, indeed, I do not hear of their boasting at all. The fact, for aught I know, is false. The French are called *vain*, because they have gained renown, which nothing can destroy or diminish as long as letters remain. No: the charge is grounded in envy; base envy, and fear as base. These malignant writers cannot endure the idea of France having a Government, which shall secure the *freedom* of the

people. They are sick at the thought of the effects of an uninterrupted communication with a people living only across the Channel, whose happiness under a *real* representation in a Legislative Body may continually be cited. These malignant writers fancy, too, that, when great numbers of people are continually crossing from one country to the other, that odd remarks may be made, and disagreeable discussions take place, as to the strange difference in the *money* of the two countries. They imagine, that those who get at Paris but about 66 guineas for a hundred pound bank note, will be surprised and disappointed. They suppose, that many thousands of persons of fixed incomes will go to live in France, *where a shilling will buy as much as half a crown buys here*. They have all these, and more than all these whims in their heads. But, suppose these to be sound opinions, it is not the fault of the French nation, nor of their Government, that our paper-money exists in such quantities, and that provisions are cheap in France, any more than it is their fault, that the climate of France is finer and more healthy than ours. Besides, have we not had the advantage of our paper-money? Has it not enabled us to hire fighters in Germany, and elsewhere? Have not the bank-notes and the loans enabled us to put Bonaparte from his throne?—Have they not enabled us to pay Russians, and Prussians, and Danes, and Austrians, and Swedes, and Portuguese, and Spaniards, and Sicilians, and God knows who besides, to fight against France; to invade her at last; and to bring the contest to a glorious termination? And ought we now to grumble, because we have a paper-money, and the French have none? Ought we to accuse the French nation of being dangerous to us on account of this difference in our pecuniary circumstances? It is as clear as day-light, that the Old Lady of Threadneedle-street has enabled our Government to overset Napoleon, and to push on the Allies to Paris. Therefore, it is abominably unjust to reproach her with having inundated us with her coin. She was compelled to do this, in order to assist us; and we ought to come now to her support. She is our military and political nurse; and to cast her off now, when we no longer stand in need of her breast, would be diabolical. Along with the cry of *Vivent les Bourbons*, ought to go forth the cry of *Vive la vieille Maman de la rue de*

Threadneedle; for, certain it is, that she has been a most efficient personage in obtaining the triumph of “social order and “regular government.” The old Lady has defeated Napoleon. It remains to be seen how she will support herself; but, I must, at all times, put in my protest against any *grumbling* on account of the *debt* and the *paper-money*; unless, indeed, on the part of those, who did not wish to carry on war for the purpose of over-setting Napoleon. They may grumble very consistently; but, even they have no right to blame the French nation for the debt, the taxes, and the paper-money.—If a hundred pound bank-note exchanges against even fifty real pounds worth of French livres, what is that to the French? They have not been the cause of this. They, probably, wished us not to hire so many people to fight against them. It is, therefore, a perfect abomination to endeavour to excite hatred against them on this account.—I hope, after all, that we shall be at *real* peace with France. I hope, that the terms of the peace will be such, as to prevent the French from seeking revenge in a new war; but, really, I am afraid, that the constantly irritating and insulting language of our newspapers must have a tendency to obstruct all endeavours to attain so desirable an object.

MILITIA OFFICERS.—An article, in all the London Papers of the 12th and 13th of this month, prepares us for some attempt to secure to these Gentlemen a share of our incomes and earnings *during peace*. It is as follows:—“**REDUCTION OF THE ARMY.**—At a time when every one is looking to the *Break*—and bidding farewell to the ‘plumed troops and spirit-stirring drum,’ the situation of Captains of the *embodied militia*, is deserving of the most serious consideration. Formerly, only men of *great landed property*, they returned to their estates after a return of peace, which no longer required them to evince the activity of arms; but the exigencies of the State have long since placed them in a very different situation. Many are now men of talents and vigour, but of *no fortune*, who have joined the militia as a profession; or who, during a long war, have estranged themselves from any other exercise of their talents; in a natural confidence, that the country, which has saved Europe by its example in arms, could not but

"preserve its renovated character as a "military nation; and, consequently, that "they would not be *thrown on the world* "unregarded. The liberality of a great "government will not fail in this respect—" and we have no doubt, that provision, in "some form, will be made, at least, to "preserve the credit of a military institu- "tion, which now so nearly approaches the "regular army. We are assured, that "several militia corps have already sub- "mitted their case to the Right Hon. the "Secretary of State, through the medium "of their Lord-Lieutenants." This is a proposition, the modesty of which must surprise, and, indeed, *confound*, the nation. What! *militia officers* paid in time of peace! We should, indeed, be a *mili- tary nation!* We should have got much by the dethronement of Napoleon. It was no longer ago than this very morning, that a neighbour of mine, who is also one of my many tax-gatherers, in asking me for my return for the Property Tax, congratulated me upon its being *the last*. I thought he was deceived; but I am *sure* of it, if the principles of this denunciation are to be acted upon. A denunciation it is, in the true sense of the word, against every man, who labours, or who has property.—We have, here, the curious distinction between men of *large fortune*, and men of *no fortune*, but of *talents* and *vigour*; no bad compliment to the Democracy at the expence of the Aristocracy! To what notions has this French Revolution given rise!—“*Thrown on the wide world!*” What, then, do these gentlemen call it being thrown on the wide world, when they are *released* from their military service? We were always told, during the war, that we were under amazing obligations to these gentlemen for their services in defence of the country; that they abandoned their homes, their peaceable professions, and their families, purely for their country's sake. But, now, behold! they *wish to be soldiers* all their lives! Mind, reader, they are persons of *no fortune*. So are the private soldiers who have escaped death in Spain, Portugal, France, Sicily, Canada, and the East and West Indies. But, are all *these*, too, to be *paid during peace?* They have a much more just claim than militia officers can possibly have.—I am amongst the last to grudge reward to military and naval merit; but, surely, one of the effects of peace ought to be, to lessen taxes, and

to send back to the arts of peace, those who have been employed in war. And this is what these gentlemen of *no fortune*, but of *talents* and *vigour*, call being *thrown upon the wide world*. If they have no fortune now, they had none before; and, therefore, they must have worked before, or starved; and so they ought now. When they entered the service, they knew that militia officers received no pay in peace. There is, therefore, no breach of faith with them. They can have no reason to complain of being neglected. They have lived in the way in which they chose to live, during the war. They were not compelled to serve as militia officers. If they have *talents* and *vigour*, what ground is there for their apprehensions of starving? Men of *talents* and *vigour* do not starve. If they be men of talents and vigour, how endless are the ways, in which those talents, and that vigour, may be employed with profit? In short, the claim is absurd, and will, I am certain, find not a single advocate in parliament.—Before I dismiss this article, I cannot help noticing a paragraph in the *Times* newspaper of the 17th inst. in these words:—“It is now pretty generally understood, that the reduction of “the militia will *not take place all at once*, “as was lately reported. Twenty regiments, it is said, will be disbanded on “the 24th of July; a second reduction “will take place on the 24th of September; and the last on the 24th of November. Several of the regiments are “now on march to the quarters where the “first reduction will take place.”—This I cannot help regarding as a *hint* on the part of those who choose this vile Paper for the vehicle of *their wishes*. What is this militia army to be kept on foot for? Are not the men wanted in the fields and in the manufactures? Are not the parishes every where heavily burdened with the support of militia-men's wives and children? And, what can this evil be prolonged for? The regular army is coming home daily. By the 1st of June, we shall have several thousands of men home from France. Our army in Sicily cannot always remain. Why then, should, we be put to the expence of supporting the militia for another half year? Did we expect that this would have been amongst the consequences of the deliverance of Europe? I should like to hear some *reason* for keeping all this army on foot so long;

One thing, however, I am quite sure of, that the army and the navy too must be reduced very low, or that *loans* must be made even in time of *peace*. The nation has to choose between the two; and, really, for my part, I do not, for myself, care much about the matter. I shall never make an out-cry about the continuation of loans and the war taxes. I shall content myself with just observing, now and then, that the Anti-jacobins ought to pay the taxes very peaceably, seeing that they have always approved of the spending of them. It is not to be denied, that the great mass of the nation *approved of the war*; that they were quite willing that the Government should spend any sum in a war against the people of France first, and then against their Sovereign. The money was spent: that Sovereign has been dethroned. It is, therefore, just that the nation should pay the bill without grumbling. Nay, if all the depots, arsenals, barracks, fortresses, military and naval academies; if all are now to be kept up, I do not see what reason those can have to complain, who have approved of all these establishments. The walls, the ramparts, the buildings, the schools of exercise, it would be such a pity to *demolish*! And what is to become of all the masters of the different branches of the art military? Would these advocates for the war have them *dig* or *beg*?—Again, I say, that one of two things must take place: the army and navy must be *reduced very low*; or, the war-taxes and loans *must be continued*. And, really, I, for my own part, do not care which of them it is to be.—The *Times* newspaper talks of the *debts* of England, France, and other nations. Paper-money is the great evidence of debt. France has none of it.—Perhaps it is a good thing to have a debt, and the greater the better. That is a point which I am not now discussing. I am only speaking of the *fact*; and the *Times* has published a false fact in this respect. “It is in vain,” says he, “for France or “England to hope speedily to exonerate “itself from the *burdens*, which that fatal “revolution has entailed upon *future genera-“rations*.”—This is intended to convey the notion, that France has a debt somewhat like ours. Nothing can be more false. The whole of the *principal* of the debt does not, I believe, equal *one year's interest* of ours. In short, the proof of the difference consists in these facts: first,

that ours is a *currency of paper*; that of France is a *currency of gold*; and, second, that a bank of England note for one hundred pounds will exchange for only about seventy pounds worth of French livres, to be paid in France in return for a bill purchased with that bank note.—These are facts, which speak a language not to be misunderstood by even the most ignorant of men. These facts shew the precise difference in the pecuniary state of the two countries.—Though a little foreign from the subject that I set out with, I will remark here, that while Napoleon was enforcing the *Continental System*, we were told, by this same newspaper, that that was the cause of the *scarcity of gold*, and of the great loss in the exchange of our paper against foreign bills, payable in gold in foreign countries. But the *Continental System* has long ceased. The author of it has been put down. France herself is become our close friend. All the ports of Europe are open to us; and there is not the least probability of their being again closed. But, yet, we do not find that gold becomes more plenty, or, that the exchange grows more favourable to us. The rate, which I have stated, is, I believe, the rate now with Paris; though, seeing the state of the relationships between the two countries, the exchange, according to the common course of things, ought to be in our favour. There is no accounting for this in any way, other than that of supposing, that our paper is become of less value than gold. Take a guinea, and it will exchange for a bill on Paris for twenty-five *livres*, two *sous*. But, take a pound bank note, and it will exchange for a bill on Paris for only about sixteen *livres*, three *sous*. This shows, at once, the real state of the case; and it shows also the folly of the hopes of those, who told us, that it was the *Continental System*, which caused the apparent depreciation in our bank-paper.—These important truths will now become more and more evident every day. The extensive intercourse with France; an intercourse which will not be confined to mere traders, but will reach to all manner of people. This intercourse, which will make hundreds of thousands see and feel the *diminution*, as they will call it, of their means in the transit of them only across the channel. This intercourse will do more towards removing the hitherto impenetrable film from the eyes of the people than a thousand Essays upon the subject.

Co
quire
to all
publis
much
know
self to
that,
wish
It ha
interes
to kee
give
must
Now,
in th
have
farme
pendi
law o
possib
how i
If the
be ch
other
only p
prices
is an
fixed,
1s. 6d
half a
But i
at 9d
to com
A wi
round
What
found
war p
(no b
excee
last y
loans
there
void o
price
interc
to be
In 17
annua
than
to les
millio
broug
To b
you
the s
bring

CORN LAWS.—This subject would require a greater space than I am able here to allot to it. So much nonsense has been published about *protecting* the farmer; so much unparalleled trash, that I hardly know where to begin. I shall confine myself to a mere hint or two; first observing, that, speaking *as a grower of wheat*, I wish for none of this sort of *protection*.—It has been said, that the manufacturing interest will suffer by any measure tending to keep up the price of corn; and, that to give the farmer security for high prices, must injure the rest of the community.—Now, in the first place, I deny, that it is in the *power* even of a body of men, who have been called *omnipotent*, to cause the farmer to have a high price; the price depending upon the *crop*, and not upon any law or any regulation. But, supposing it possible to give the farmer a high price, how is that to injure the eaters of bread? If the corn be cheap, all other things will be cheap in proportion; and, amongst other things, the produce of the manufactures. The *fund-holder* seems to be the only person with reason to complain of high prices; because he has *nothing to sell*. He is an annuitant, whose nominal income is fixed, and therefore, when the loaf is at 1s. 6d. his annuity is worth to him only half as much as when the loaf is at 9d. But if the loaf were to be, and to continue at 9d. for any length of time, *whence is to come the money to pay him his annuity?* A wish has been expressed *to bring things round by degrees to the prices of 1792!* What profound *ignorance*; or, what profound *hypocrisy*! In 1792, or before the war preparations, the whole of the taxes (no loans) raised in the country did not exceed fourteen millions. The taxes raised last year, 1813, amounted (exclusive of loans) to sixty-nine millions. And yet, there are men so devoid of *sense*, or so devoid of *shame*, as to talk of bringing round prices to the state of 1792! The annual interest on the debt (which must *continue to be paid*) is now about forty millions. In 1792, it was nine millions. All the annual expences in 1792 amounted to less than five millions. Can they now amount to less, even in time of peace, than twenty millions? How, then, are prices to be brought round to the standard of 1792? To bring prices to the standard of 1792, you must first *bring round* the taxes to the standard of 1792, and next you must *bring round* gold in place of paper.—

So that these wise advocates of *low prices* are beginning their amiable endeavours at the wrong end.—If the wheat were at five shillings a bushel; beer at 2d. a quart; beef at 3d. a pound; it would make no difference to the farmer, except for the remainder of his lease. It would make no difference to Mr. Coke, or Sir Francis Burdett, or any other land-holder, to whom 5,000l. a year would be as valuable as 20,000l. a year now is. It would give them the means of living just in the style that they now live. But, then, in both cases, the taxes must be diminished in the same proportion; and, in place of collecting 69 millions a year, you must collect only 23 millions at most, which would but little more than *HALF suffice for the payment of the interest on the Debt*, leaving the Civil List, the Army, the Navy, and every other out-going wholly unprovided for.—It has been observed, with most brazen impudence, or with more than ideot folly, that it is unjust thus to *put money into the pocket of the land-holder*, at the expence of the poor soul who *hardly earns his morsel of bread*. In the first place, Mr. Coke, for instance, if he let his land at 30s. an acre instead of 10s. must pay for servants, for horses, for carriages, for beer, for bread, for every thing on which he lays out his money, 3s. instead of 1s. How, then, can the high price of corn give him any advantage over the poorer people who serve him, or who administer to his wants or his pleasures? Besides, he must pay 3s. in taxes instead of 1s. So that, in fact, as far as this goes, it is the Government, or the public, or the debt, or the State, or, call it what you will, which in the end *receives the difference*.—Those who eat the loaf must, of course, pay the tax. We see very plainly how the tax upon sugar, or upon spirits, fall upon the consumer; but the tax upon bread being collected, not upon the *loaf*, or the *flour*, or the *wheat*, we lose sight of its march to our mouths. But, if it be collected upon the earth, in which the wheat grows; upon the house in which the grower lives; upon the horses that plough the land for the wheat; upon the iron and the leather that make up the harness for the horses that plough the land for the wheat; upon the gig that carries to church the wheat grower's wife; upon the nag that carries the wheat grower, the next day, to market to sell the wheat; upon the cloddy-heeled boy, who becomes a gentle-

man's servant, for his looking after the nag and brushing the shoes of the wheat-grower; upon the dog, whose teeth are necessary to protect the wheat-grower's barns; upon the stamps of the wheat-grower's lease, his receipts, and his notes of hand; upon the sugar, the coffee, the tea, the soap, the candles, the pepper, the salt, the very drugs, and a score of other things, used in the house of the wheat-grower; upon the malt that makes the beer necessary to keep his nerves steady amidst the bewildering of such an accumulation: if the tax be collected upon all these, must it not be paid, at last, by those who *eat the loaf*, made out of the wheat? And if the wheat-grower gets little money for his crop, is it not evident that he can have little money to pay to the Government in any shape whatever? Is it not, in other words, evident, that if wheat, (*generally the regulator of all other commodities*) continue to be of the present price, the interest of the debt cannot be paid?—Mind, reader, I am no advocate for *law* that is now pending. I know, that the thing will, and must, regulate itself. If, by importations from countries where the land is more fertile and less taxed than ours, wheat were to become too cheap to make it profitable to grow it here in the present average quantity, less would be grown here; the capital, the labour, the means of all sorts, now used for the raising of corn, would, in part, be used for other purposes; and some of those who are now farmers would turn their hands to other employments. I see no harm in this. But the thing is impossible. No such effort, it appears to me, can be produced by importations from abroad, the quantity being too small to be of any consequence. I think, that Mr. Coke, and the other advocates of the Bill, proceed upon erroneous notions of the effect of importation. But, at the same time, they are by no means chargeable with *injustice*. Their endeavours, in fact, tend to the protection, not of the *farmer* but of the *fund-holder*, and of those who depend on the *Civil List*. Their endeavours, they being landholders, are very disinterested, seeing that their inevitable tendency is to enable the grower of wheat to draw money from the eaters of bread, and to pay it over to the Government.—I do not know how it has happened, but no one appears to me to have viewed the matter in this its natural light. Some persons

have talked of the *hardship* upon the farmer to pay such heaps of taxes. The hardship consists wholly in the trouble, and the torment, and the humiliation: for the farmer does, and *must* get the amount of the taxes back again from the *bread-eater*. He may not do it for one year, or for two years; but, upon an average, he *must*. The tax pursues the commodity to the *mouth*, as necessarily rivers find their way to the sea. I view the wheat-grower as a collector of money to be paid over to the agents of the Government; and, if others did the same, I am of opinion that we should hear much less about the *grasping disposition* of the landholders and their tenants. I dislike the talk about that "*valuable class of men, the agriculturists*," as the farmers are now called. I do not see any peculiar claim that they have to such an appellation. They till the land for gain, just as a shoe-maker makes shoes for gain, and as a merchant, or manufacturer, carries on his business for gain. I see no *obligation* that the community is under to the growers of wheat, who sell it as dear as they can. They are entitled to no special mark of legislative favour; but, as they are the grand vehicle for the taxes, it is the height of stupidity to express wishes to make them an unproductive vehicle.—As very closely connected with this view of the corn subject, I will here notice what has been said about *bringing round our CURRENCY* to the standard of 1796; that is to say, when gold was in free and general circulation. How such an idea came into the head of any one accounted sane, I am at a loss to discover. We were told, that *peace*, upon a firm foundation, would do the thing of itself. It is notorious that a *light guinea* will sell now for 26 or 27 shillings in paper. But the worst, the most foolish part of the conduct of those who entertain the notion of restoring our currency to the standard of 1796, is, that they allow, at the same time, that the paper money is depreciated; and (*now observe*) that this depreciation has had the effect of *raising prices*.—Very well. It is *depreciated*, and it has *raised prices*.—Keep this in mind, and then ask these wise men, what would be the effect of "*restoring the currency to its former healthy state*."—These gentlemen, in their anxious desire to restore guineas, overlook the *interest of the debt*. But, is it not manifest, that they ought to have this object continually

in the
the s
ing A
that,
for a
must
augm
nual
plagu
tail
deem
in r
quire
of a
Supp
artic
aver
ters;
exch
below
price
to th
quen
rage
farm
inter
of co
a-yea
neas
This
head
light
in re
lionz
But,
cers
fixed
rent
expo
to p
here
law
the
that
with
and
does
the
sak
nion
two
it w
or,
the
that
pay
wh
the
the

in their view, when they are talking upon the subject of restoring guineas and *lowering prices*? And is it not also manifest, that, in whatever degree *prices be lowered* for a permanency, the interest of the debt must, in *reality*, though *not nominally*, be *augmented*?—Now, then, what is the annual interest of this debt? I will not plague the reader with any miserable detail about funded and unfunded, and redeemed and unredeemed; but will state, in round numbers, that the debt requires taxes to be paid to the amount of about forty millions a year.—Suppose then, that *wheat* (to take that article as an instance) be now upon *an average of years*, 27*l.* a load, of five quarters; the paper-money has, at the rate of exchange with Paris, depreciated *one third* below gold; and, of course, has *raised prices one-third*. Bring the currency back to the standard of 1796, and the consequence is, that wheat will be upon an average of years, 18*l.* a load. Well, then, farmer *Stiles*, whose share of payment of interest of the debt is 27*l.* a-year, and who, of course, used to pay a *load of wheat*, a-year, must, upon the restoration of guineas, pay a *load and a half of wheat a-year*. This would make the farmer scratch his head, I believe! It is as clear as daylight, that the restoration of guineas would, in reality, make the debt cost sixty millions a-year instead of forty millions a-year. But, this is not all. The Civil List, officers of all kinds, pay, pensions, annuities, fixed stipends of every sort, leases, ground-rents, rent-charges, must all become more expensive by *one-third* to those who have to pay them. What a revolution would be here? What smashing, what work for lawyers and bill-framers! Besides, as to the *justice* of the thing, I am so certain that it is impossible for it to take place without the utter destruction of the paper, and the debt along with the paper, that it does seem to me superfluous to talk about the justice or the policy of it; but, for the sake of those who may not be of my opinion as to this point, I will say a word or two as to the *justice* of such a measure, if it were practicable.—The greater part, or, at least, a very considerable part, of the debt has been contracted since 1796; that is to say, since the Bank ceased to pay their bills in specie. Of course, those who have lent the Government this part of the money, have lent them *paper-money* of the same, or nearly the same value, with

the present paper-money. To pay these people their interest, therefore, in specie, would be to give them one-third more than is really their due; and, in the same degree, it would be to do wrong to those who have to pay that interest.—The same may be said with regard to all offices, pensions, grants, rent-charges, &c. which have originated since 1796.—But, as I said before, the thing is impossible.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer is reported to have said, that it was *probable*, that the Government would *not* call upon the Bank to pay in specie in six months after the signature of the definitive treaty of peace. His answer was wise. It is really very probable indeed, that the Bank will *not* be so called upon.—Oh, dear! What curious things this glorious event in France will bring to light, and bring about! Very probable indeed, that the Bank will *not* be called upon to pay in specie! This peace will put many an one to his trumps!

DANGER SEEN IN TIME.

Mr. COBBETT.—Thus, then, ends the *liberty* and *independence* of nations. Norway is to be *free* and *independent*, under the blessed domination of Bernadotte.—Poland is to be *free* and *independent*, under the happy auspices of Alexander, the liberator. The knowt will free the miserable peasants, as, by the wholesome exercise of dancing to it, their matted hair will be impelled to untwist. Italy is to be *free* and *independent*, under German legislation, the profundity of whose matchless regulations has long astonished the world. Saxony, the garden of Germany, is to be *free* and *independent*, under the measured discipline of Prussia and the sagacious policy of Austria. France is to be *free* and *independent*, under the hereditary rule of an erudite Bourbon, and the wholesome restraints of a Constitution, coming into life under the fostering auspices of 200,000 bayonets, wielded by congenial heroes, issuing from all the regions, from the Adour to the Rhine.—Spain is to be *free* and *independent*, under Ferdinand the Seventh and the Spanish Constitution, both enlightened by the wisdom of ages and experience. Every expectation is answered, at least, every reasonable expectation. The *people* of Europe, to whom the appeal has been so loudly made, are become all that they could expect to be; all that it was meant that they should be, “They are content.”

—Be it so.—If they are, they deserve no more than is actually accorded to them.—The question is, however, are they content? It is very possible that it may be highly unreasonable in them not to rest satisfied, for all that they could hope for will be given them. If they hoped for more, they must have been void of common sense. Unless they were the merest children, it is for this they shed their blood; it is for this they must have known that they were shedding it. But, however that may be, they may have entertained unreasonable expectations, or they may, by this time, repent of their moderation. The moment is critical. They may conceive it not too late to retrace their steps, or to manifest their repentence. The purpose of this paper is to alarm the Allied Sovereigns, as to the posture of affairs, and to shew them how auspicious the crisis is to that spirit of insubordination, formerly miscalled the spirit of freedom, should the madness of the people still lead them to dream of *liberty* and *independence*. In all the countries of Europe, from the Ural mountains to the Atlantic, there are no forces of any consequence to maintain the different regions in their happy possession of the *liberty* and *independence* for which they have so profusely shed their blood, except in the heart of France. Those troops which are left behind may not be depended upon, as the madness of misunderstood *liberty* and *independence* may, like a contagion, spread from the people into their ranks. A shoemaker in Germany may raise the *cry*, and it may be echoed from the Danube to the Dwina. An infuriate Jacobin in France may kindle the torch of discord, and occupation sufficient may be given to the 200,000 regenerators of Europe in that country, which, to render all things safe, they must not only conquer, as they have done, but finally crush. The cry of *union*, which infatuates the Italians, may lead them to chase the *forrestieres*, the strangers, over the Alps, to their Teutonic abodes. Alas! if such a moment as this were seized to unite the German name, to amalgamate the Italian population, to rouse the French spirit of revenge, what can be opposed to the mighty torrent that might thus inundate the States from the Baltic to the Mediterranean? Sovereigns, save the troops which you have assembled so successfully to restore *liberty* and *independence* to the world. See you not that Po-

land and Saxony, and all Germany and Italy, are behind you, who might, if they have foolishly expected any thing from you, that you have not granted, or any thing except your own paternal sway over them; if they have unreasonably looked for any thing that has been left unaccomplished—who might, in that case, form the diabolical design of intercepting the return of your armies, in the certainty that their unholy designs would have no military force, after that, to combat. I tremble for you. A start of the maddened people destroys your sacred authority in one moment, which would have nothing more left with which to support itself. Methinks I hear the cursed word *liberty* profaned by vulgar tongues, and darting like lightning from one end of the heaven to the other, and penetrating even your consecrated legions. Down, in a moment, are tumbled crowns, and coronets, and mitres, and a sound sweeps from the face of the earth all that ages have venerated and canonized. Such a moment never before existed! The work of the giants is accomplished by children! The force of Europe being concentrated in the heart of France, is shivered to atoms with a breath! Do not rely on the newly restored Monarch, for, either he may, which is not certainly very likely for a long while, identify himself with his country, and foolishly imagine what you well know is mere madness, that the interests of himself and of the French people are the same; or, which is more likely, and which may be expected from his wisdom, purchased by so much experience, he may more profoundly penetrate into the true nature of things, and clearly see that France is his own, and made for him, and for him to rule. But, in either case, he can do you little service. Of the first supposition it is idle to speak, as then his first wish and resolution must be to drive you out of his territories. The second supposition makes him indeed your's; but he enters your camp alone, and leaves France in array against you and himself, while the world behind you is ready to intercept your retreat. I tremble for you, august Potentates! Save yourselves before the mad project be conceived. Dispatch the instruments of your mild sovereignty to the several countries to which you have restored *liberty* and *independence*, by graciously conceding to them the boon of your parental sway. Restraine the madness of the people, who can be no judges of *liberty*

and *independence*, and who must be ignorant what is for their advantage, since you know well how extensive the sway of ignorance is over the face of this obstinate globe, whose inhabitants *will* know nothing in spite of every effort to instruct them. A wholesome vigour is necessary: break down their obstinacy; crush their madness; make them love and revere you by the seasonable severity of your primitive justice? Do not you see your danger? Is it not imminent? Flee to meet it, or you are undone! You are on a hideous precipice, and will not, I fear, see it in time. Your enemies will be quicker of sight, if you are not prompt to take advice. You will have no excuse for delay, as you are forewarned. See, the *torch* is going to be lighted! The *cry* is on the tip of the tongue of the misled people! You will not know whom to trust in your greatest need. The *fire* may seize your camp; the *whoop* may be raised by your practised battalions: people, refrain, refrain; take thankfully your *liberty* and *independence*. What do you want more? you have all that you deserve, if you expected more, or if you once had no further expectations. In the one case, how unreasonable not to be content with the completion of your hopes! In the other case, how could you be so idiotic? Expect more! Alas, alas, ye were mere beasts, and should be contented to be treated as such. Down on your marrow-bones to ask a blessing, or a pardon of the anointed of God.—HORTATOR.

PROGRESS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.—If we are to believe the prostituted press of this country, France is again on the eve of being involved in all those scenes of anarchy and blood, which afflicted her during the predominance of discordant factions—even while the Paris Journals are altogether *silent* as to the pretended convulsions in that and other cities, the public attention here is occupied with private letters from the French capital, in which are given minute details of alleged insurrections, of disturbances which ended in bloodshed, and of symptoms in the state of political opinion, which indicate the approach of some terrible revolutionary commotion. It is easy to divine the motives which give rise to these alarming reports. The newspapers engaged in propagating them, find, since the fever of war, and the fervor of political strife subsided, that there has been a dreadful fall-

ing off in their gains, which threatens very shortly to destroy the source which has so long afforded them an abundant harvest, from which they have for so many years derived the wages of prostitution. Their object, therefore, is to revive the system, to give life to the horrid and abominable traffic, by which they were enriched, at the expence of all that is dear to humanity.—It is gratifying, however, to observe, that the acts of the present government of France promise to secure to the French nation a long and uninterrupted repose; and that all the attempts which have been made to injure that gallant people, will have no other effect than to overwhelm with confusion those who have so basely and enviously attempted to destroy and to degrade them.—The following declaration of the King of France, recently published, sufficiently shews, that he considers his own interests inseparable from those of his people, and justifies the opinion, that the French, under his reign, may long enjoy a considerable portion of happiness.—“Louis, by the grace of God, King of France and Navarre, to all those to whom these presents shall come, greeting:—On ascending the Throne of our ancestors, we have found our rights in your love, and have given up our whole heart to that sentiment manifested of old by Louis XII. the father of his people, and by the good King Henry IV. Their incessant application to the happiness of France shall mark our reign also; and it is our most ardent wish that it may in its turn leave behind recollections worthy of being associated with the memory of those Sovereigns, whose first and noblest virtue was paternal affection.—Amidst acclamation, so unanimous and so sooth-ing to our heart, with which we were accompanied from the frontiers of our Kingdom to the bosom of our capital, we have never ceased to consider the situation of our provinces and of our brave armies. The oppression which crushed France has left behind it many evils, by which we are keenly touched; our concern on account of them is profound, but their weight will be daily diminished; all our care shall be directed to this point, and our highest pleasure will increase with the felicity of our people. Already an armistice, concluded in conformity with the views of an enlightened and moderate policy, dispenses its benefits as the forerunners of peace; and the

"Treaty, which is to establish it in a durable manner, is the most constant, as well as the most important, object of our thoughts. In a short time, the olive, the pledge of the repose of Europe, will be displayed to the nations that require it. The allied armies are beginning to move towards our frontiers, and the august Sovereigns, whose principles have been so generous in regard to us, are nobly desirous of closely uniting themselves with us by the ties of a mutual friendship and confidence that shall never be broken. We know that some individual abuses have been committed, and that contributions have been levied upon the departments of our kingdom since the conclusion of the armistice, but the just and liberal declarations which the Allied Sovereigns have made to us respecting these abuses, authorise us to forbid our subjects to comply with such requisitions as are illegal and contrary to the Treaty, which has stipulated for the general suspension of hostilities. Nevertheless, our gratitude, and the usage of war, require us to order all the Civil and Military Authorities in our dominions to redouble their care and attention, that the valiant armies of the Allied Sovereigns may be regularly and abundantly supplied with all that is necessary for the subsistence and wants of the troops. All demands not comprehended in these objects shall therefore be of no effect, and the sacrifices of the people will be diminished. Frenchmen! you hear the King, and he wished, in his turn, that your voice may reach him, and express your wants and your desires; his shall always attest the love which he bears to his people. The largest cities, and the most obscure hamlets, all parts of his kingdom, are equally objects of his care, and he presses all his subjects at one and the same time to his heart. He does not think that he can indulge feelings too paternal for people whose valour, loyalty, and devotion to their Sovereigns, have for ages constituted their glory and prosperity."

LOUIS.

Several ordonances have likewise been published in France, all tending, like the above proclamation, to promote tranquillity, and to prepare the people for the enjoyment of the blessings of peace. Aware also, that France can never be great and powerful unless her troops are put upon a respectable footing, the King seems to have

directed his particular attention to the proper organization of the army, and to the just rewards which are due to men who have procured so much glory to their country. In furtherance of the intentions of his Majesty towards these brave soldiers, the following has been made public:

WAR DEPARTMENT.—ORDER OF THE DAY.—PARIS, MAY 15, 1814.—His Majesty has just determined on the organization of his army. After having heard the Council of War, he has issued an ordonance of the most favourable nature possible, for establishing the new Military Constitution; and he has less consulted the finances of the State, than his justice, in rewarding honourable services, and his affection for his brave troops.—Inspectors-General, furnished with instructions from the Ministers of War, will depart to form the amalgamation of all the corps. It is important that all such officers, who have rights to claim or rewards to solicit, should appear under their respective banners: the absence of these officers, during this operation, will lead to serious and irreparable inconveniences. It is consequently necessary, that every military officer, of whatever rank, should appear without delay, with the corps to which he belongs, in order to lay the state of his services before the Inspectors-General, and to obtain either his continuation in active service, the preservation of his full appointments, the enjoyment of half-pay at home until replaced; or, finally, to be permitted to retire in consequence of the rights he may have acquired by new services since the month of January, 1814.—Those officers who do not belong to any corps, those of the staff without appointments, and those who wish to be placed in regiments, shall present themselves, according to their choice, in the chief places of the divisions or departments in which there are Inspectors-General, to make representations of their services; those who prefer half-pay may retire to their homes.—Every officer who, without express permission, shall remain at Paris eight days after the publication of the present order, shall be held to have renounced his right.—The soldiers who do not belong to the corps of the garrison of Paris shall be immediately marched, under the immediate direction of the Commander of the place, to their respective corps, or to one of the nearest

"con
"wi
"mi
"ex
"ac
"W
"D
"the
—W
pend
the
exam
votin
on th
Fran
Add
marie
pres
Roge
that
Lock
and s
unans
respo
Wes
tions
ing
Ame
prop
thing
Min
of th
ing
lear
this
that
"fle
he ha
mani
Fran
ment
consi
voiced

THE
ER
M
On
Fran
been
it ha
High
lation
a spe
nity,
the b
ente
the F
vern
expr

"corps, in order to be incorporated there-with.—The Generals commanding the military divisions shall enforce the strictest execution of this order, and shall render account thereof to the Minister for the War Department.—General Count DUPONT, Minister Secretary of State for the War Department."

WESTMINSTER ADDRESS.—The independent inhabitants of this great city, are the only persons who have followed the example of the citizens of London, in voting an Address to the Prince Regent on the late termination of hostilities against France. I have subjoined a copy of this Address, upon which some useful remarks may probably occur after it has been presented, and an Answer given by the Regent. Meanwhile it may be stated, that the Address, which was read by J. Lochee, Esq. moved by Major Cartwright, and seconded by Peter Walker, Esq. was unanimously approved of by a very large and respectable Meeting of the Electors of Westminster. Several spirited Resolutions were also adopted without a dissenting voice, except as to one about America, to which an amendment was proposed by a person who said something about the great *wisdom* which Ministers had displayed in their conduct of the war, and talked loud about *punishing the American savages*. I could not learn the individual's name who proposed this amendment—but it was whispered that he was a *Contractor*; and his "full fledged plumage" shewed that, at least, he had not been a *loser* by the warlike mania. It was justly remarked by Sir Francis Burdett, that the proposed amendment had met its deserved fate, in being consigned to oblivion by the unanimous voice of the assembly.

ADDRESS TO THE REGENT.

THE DUTIFUL ADDRESS OF THE HOUSEHOLDERS OF THE CITY AND LIBERTIES OF WESTMINSTER.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR ROYAL HIGHNESS. On a termination of the conflict with France, in which our country has so long been engaged—a termination as fortunate as it has been singular, we beg your Royal Highness to accept of our sincere congratulations.—In a war so sanguinary, it has been a spectacle as novel, as auspicious to humanity, to behold a coalition of Sovereigns, at the head of immense armies, on victoriously entering the capital of their enemy, inviting the People to choose the Constitution of Government under which they desired to live, expressing a wish that that People might

ever remain great and happy, and proclaiming a guarantee of their Liberties.—May, Sir, the Prince they recalled to reign over them hold those liberties sacred!—For the benefits of Peace, we ought to be truly thankful to Providence; as well as to those by whose valour and labours, or by whose virtue and wisdom they have, under Providence, been attained.—But, Sir, we should ill acquit ourselves of the duty we owe to our country, and to your Royal Highness, as the Representative of our Sovereign, did we not entreat you to couple with the praise-worthy conclusion of the war its blameable commencement.—Your Royal Highness would then see, that what we now contemplate as a happy result to France, namely, the government of a represented People by a limited King, might have continued as it then existed, without any war at all.—In that case, Sir, the world had not been disgusted by the atrocities of a Robespierre, nor terrified by the portentous power of a Bonaparte. In that case Europe had escaped a sacrifice of three millions of human lives and countless calamities. In that case, England had not seen degraded to paupers a million and a half of her industrious people, nor have felt the scourge of a Taxation for paying the annual interest of an incurred debt of eight hundred millions sterling.—As, however, Divine Providence brings good out of evil, and as it accords with experience, that a constant growth of knowledge is the effect of an ever-operating cause, and eminently beneficial to civilized man; so we cannot but attribute the moderation and wisdom, so eminently displayed by the Allied Sovereigns, to that growth of knowledge, to that diffusion of truth, which, in our age, is daily enlightening the civilized world.—If, Sir, the American and French Revolutions had their accompaniments of calamity, yet the innumerable discussions they generated, did also improve, in a high degree, the science of civil government—master science of Princes and Statesmen. The Monarchs who have as virtuously as wisely guaranteed Peace, Greatness, and Liberty to France, as well as their Ministers, and Warriors, must carry home with them from Paris the seeds of amelioration, the scientific principles of amendment, by which the condition of their own subjects will be greatly bettered; and by which, without convulsion, their States may be rapidly made to enjoy that perfection of polity, that freedom and prosperity, which is equally the ornament and felicity of Princes and of People. In the political transactions of both hemispheres, those intelligent Monarchs must have seen a full confirmation of this important truth, that "*Representation was the happiest discovery of political wisdom.*" To this point, they must have observed, that all rational energies in pursuit of public freedom and happiness uniformly tend.—

Wherefore, Sir, we cannot doubt, that in all civilized countries Representation will in time attain perfection. When, Sir, your Royal Highness shall reflect, that after a war of more than twenty years continuance, originally undertaken for crushing the infant liberties of France, the existence of those very liberties is now found to afford the only hope of tranquillity to Europe, and has therefore been made the basis of Peace, we must, with additional earnestness, recur to the impression we endeavoured three years ago to make on the mind of your Royal Highness—an endeavour in which, we trust, we succeeded—in favour of such a radical Reform in the Commons House of Parliament of our own country, as shall afford us the full benefit of Representation. In our former Address to your Royal Highness, we spoke of that Borough Faction which alike tramples on the Rights of the Crown and People. Were, Sir, that Faction to continue its daring inroad on the Independence of the Throne,—were it to continue its deadly stabs to the Liberties of the People.—were it to continue its depredations on the property of the nation—were, in short, our Freedom to be no more, of what value Peace, or aught else on earth!—In proportion, Sir, as a constitutional Commons House must be an object of unbounded veneration, your Royal Highness will be sensible that the existence of a Faction, which should greatly impair its excellence, must to every loyal mind be exquisitely painful. The yoke of a Faction—a domestic Faction—that had feloniously broken into the citadel of the Constitution and stollen our Palladium, were even worse than foreign war itself. It were the tyranny of a few, who had no other claim to rule over their fellow subjects than that of having robbed them. It were to bow the head and bend the knee to an audacious corruption. It were the very lowest depth of dishonour. On the part, Sir, of an English Sovereign, on the part of an English People, to such a Faction there could be no submission. A truly patriot Representative stands, however, pledged to his constituents and his country, to bring before Parliament, at the first convenient opportunity, their great question. It is, Sir, impossible that Parliament should then be at war with England. It is impossible that it should not then imitate those Sovereigns who, even while at war with France, eagerly sought the opportunity of offering to her their guarantee of all she claimed as her Rights and Liberties. After contemplating,

with the highest admiration, the virtue and wisdom so conspicuous in the arrangements made on the first day of April at Paris, we are unable, Sir, to express the deep concern and the shame we feel, touching the hostile measure which your Royal Highness has been advised to sanction in respect of Norway. If it be just that any one Nation shall provide for its own welfare and happiness by the exercise of its own reason, and the freedom of its own will, it must be just that every Nation shall freely do the same. England, Sir, can have no right to force on Norway a sovereignty to which she is adverse. For such a purpose, to draw the sword were manifestly wicked; but to attempt to subdue Independence, Innocence and Patriotism, by the instrumentality of famine, were shockingly inhuman. We humbly, Sir, and most anxiously intreat your Royal Highness to save your country from this reproach; to avert from her this dishonour. And, Sir, among the many happy results of the pacification of Europe, we contemplate, with inexpressible satisfaction, the annihilation of the disputed points respecting the maritime rights of neutral nations, which have constituted the ground of the ever-lamentable hostility in which we are engaged with the United States of America. Hence, Sir, we confidently trust, that on both sides of the Atlantic the miseries and immoralities of war will shortly be at an end, and the whole civilized world repose under the peaceful olive; studying and practising only the social and moral duties, arts and accomplishments, for their general improvement and happiness.

F The Friends of the Freedom of Election will be gratified to find that the *Seventh Anniversary* of the Election of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, to represent the City of Westminster in Parliament, is to be celebrated at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, on Monday next, by a public dinner. The chair will be filled by Sir FRANCIS.—The following, among other respectable Gentlemen, intend to be present:—E. B. Clive, Esq.; Sir John Throgmorton; Robert Knight, Esq.; J. Josling, Esq.; Thomas Northmore, Esq.; W. J. Burdett, Esq.; R. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Mr. Alderman Wood; Henry Brougham, Esq.; Hon. Thomas Brand; R. H. A. Bennet, Esq.; Thomas Creevey, Esq. Francis Canning, Esq.; — Gwynn, Esq.; Mr. Waithman.